Filed 09/25/2006 Page 1 of 14 U. S. DISTRICT COURT N.D. OF N. Y. FILED UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SEP 2 6 2003 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK AT O'CLOCK CONTEC CORPORATION, LAWRENCE K. BAERMAN, Clerk UTICA Plaintiff, 1:03-CV-910 REMOTE SOLUTION CO., Defendant. DAVID N. HURD United States District Judge ORDER Pursuant to the oral decision of the Court, entered into the record after hearing oral argument on September 26, 2003, in Albany, New York, it is hereby ORDERED that 1. The complaint is DISMISSED for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, without prejudice to file an amended complaint on or before October 10, 2003; and 2. The motion and cross motion are DISMISSED as moot, without prejudice to renew within thirty days after the filing of an amended complaint, if any. IT IS SO ORDERED. States District Judge Dated: September 26, 2003

Utica, New York.

		2
l		
2	APPEARANCES:	
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	
4	McNAMEE, LOCHNER LAW FIRM	
5	BY: G. KIMBALL WILLIAMS, ESQ.	
6	-and-	
7	PENNIE & EDMONDS LAW FIRM	
8	BY: KENNETH L. STEIN, ESQ.	
9		
10		
11	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	
12	NOLAN, HELLER LAW FIRM	
13	BY: JUSTIN A. HELLER, ESQ.	
14	-and-	
15	FINGER, SLANINA LAW FIRM	
16	BY: DAVID FINGER, ESQ.	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
Contec v. Remote Solution - 03-CV-910
                                                               3
 1
                     (Court convened at 12:37 PM.)
 2
                    THE CLERK: Contec Corporation versus Remote
     Solution Company, 03-CV-910.
 3
 4
                    Counselors, your appearance for the record,
 5
     please.
 6
                    MR. STEIN: Ken Stein, for Contec
 7
     Corporation, from Pennie & Edmonds.
 8
                    MR. WILLIAMS: Kim Williams, from McNamee,
 9
     Lochner, Titus & Williams, for Contec Corporation.
                    MR. HELLER: Justin Heller, Nolan & Heller,
10
     on behalf of Remote Solution.
11
                    MR. FINGER: David Finger, Finger & Slanina,
12
13
     on behalf of Remote Solution Company, admitted.
14
                    MR. HELLER: Your Honor, just procedurally,
     we filed a pro hac vice motion on behalf of Mr. Finger. I
15
     just don't know whether it has been signed yet.
16
                    THE COURT: Yes, it has been signed and
17
     Mr. Finger, you are now authorized to practice law in the
18
     Northern District of New York with regards to this case.
19
                    MR. FINGER: Thank you, your Honor.
20
21
                    MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, I believe the same
     is true for Mr. Stein.
22
                    THE COURT: All right.
23
                    MR. STEIN: Good morning, your Honor.
24
25
     Contec's motion seeks to compel Remote Solution to
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

arbitrate --

THE COURT: All right, you're all here now. Let me just get this out of the way right now.

The Second Circuit has reminded us District judges on more occasions than I care to admit that we should not -- be careful never to go in and take matters without subject matter jurisdiction. There's been more appeals where, all of a sudden, the Second Circuit says that there's no subject matter jurisdiction and why has the District Judge been spending all this time.

Now, in this case, the plaintiff is Contec Corporation, and I know that you've submitted an affidavit and reply that the contract at issue here is before Contec, LP, and you're the successor in interest, but that's not in the complaint as it stands. And as I see it, until you file an amended complaint -- and I'll give you time -- that I have no subject matter jurisdiction on this matter at this time.

And what I am proposing to do is to dismiss the case without prejudice and give you some time to file an amended complaint so that I do have subject matter jurisdiction, and then we can proceed further, because your complaint does not give me subject matter jurisdiction, unless you can tell me otherwise. I mean, I know you replied, and you may very well have jurisdiction under the

Contec v. Remote Solution - 03-CV-910 5 proper circumstances, but I don't believe I have it right 1 2 now. 3 That's where we stand. And I am not gonna be subjected to the Second Circuit wondering why I'm hearing 4 5 argument and spending my time on this until I do. Can you б tell me why I shouldn't do what I am proposing to do? 7 MR. STEIN: I believe that Contec Corporation 8 has assumed Contec, LP's rights under the contract. 9 THE COURT: Yes, I know what you said. But the contract, as alleged in the complaint, is between 10 11 Contec, LP, and Remote Solutions, and there's nothing of what you're telling me that's in the complaint. What you 12 have said in reply may very well give me subject matter 13 14 jurisdiction, but it's not in the complaint and that's where 15 we start with and that's where they would have an 16 opportunity to challenge this or whatever. But it's not in the complaint, and at the moment, it's a collateral issue. 17 MR. STEIN: I believe that the complaint does 18 say that the agreement's between Contec Corporation and 19 Remote Solution. 20 THE COURT: Well, who is the contract 21 between? Who are the two parties to the contract that 22 23 you're trying to enforce?

MR. STEIN: The original parties that signed the contract were Contec, LP, and Remote Solution. Contec,

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Contec v. Remote Solution - 03-CV-910

LP, changed form, first to Contec, LLC, and then changed form to Contec Corporation.

THE COURT: Is that in the complaint?

MR. STEIN: What?

THE COURT: Is that in the complaint?

MR. STEIN: I don't believe that those two facts are in the complaint, but the complaint refers only to the contract between Contec Corporation, which is the only entity that exists at the present time, and Remote Solution.

THE COURT: Do you have the contract? Who is the contract between?

MR. STEIN: At the time the contract was signed, it was between Contec, LP, and Remote Solution.

THE COURT: Okay.

Contec, LP, no longer exists. MR. STEIN: changed form to LLC and then to the Corporation.

THE COURT: Is that in the complaint? Did that situation, that you have a contract that now you are representing the successor in interest to that, is that in the complaint? I mean, we have two separate entities here is what I'm faced with in the complaint. You have the contract with Contec, LP, but the plaintiff here is Contec Corporation.

MR. STEIN: Right. I think that the complaint only alleges that there's an agreement between

Contec v. Remote Solution - 03-CV-910

Contec Corporation at this point and Remote Solution, which
I believe is accurate.

THE COURT: It's not accurate. The contract is between Contec, LP, and Remote Solution.

MR. STEIN: Right. But Contec Corporation assumed the rights of Contec, LP, under the agreement, so I think it is -- I believe it's --

THE COURT: Why not file an amended complaint and get that straightened out so we don't have any issue here? I am willing to give you time to file an amended complaint.

MR. STEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: But I just believe that there's some ambiguity here. And I don't know what the defendant's position is in regards to that issue. They raised the question here in their response, you raised the issue.

Well, let me hear from the defendant. What's your position on this matter? You raised the issue, and I just want to be sure that if I go through the effort of deciding this case on the merits that I have jurisdiction. That's all I want. And do you agree to accept an amended complaint? Or what's your position?

MR. FINGER: Your Honor, again, first, initially, let me thank the Court for allowing me to practice here today.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think there's another issue that adds to your Honor's concern. Although it's not stated in any of the papers, the Contec Corporation is not a New York entity, it's a Delaware entity. They have not said that in the papers. And so, under the Federal Arbitration Act, the law of that does not confer subject matter jurisdiction. So, there is a diversity issue that has to be established factually.

Filed 09/25/2006

And I agree, the Court doesn't have jurisdiction, because it doesn't have facts in the complaint establishing a prima facie right on behalf of Contec Corporation. We believe that your Honor's approach is appropriate, that the matter should be dismissed without prejudice, allow them to file a new action, new complaint, and we are happy to go from there.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Stein, do you want to be heard further before I -- I mean, this is --

MR. STEIN: Yes, I would. As to the new point Mr. Finger just raised about Contec Corporation, the complaint says, in paragraph one, that Contec Corporation is a Delaware corporation. And that's yet another argument that he's raising --

MR. FINGER: Your Honor, he's right, it does say in the complaint. I was in error. It does refer to a Delaware corporation, I apologize.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. STEIN: I guess I'm just wondering if it's possible for me to -- because I haven't thought about this issue before. In fact, before the opposition was filed by Remote Solution, there was never any disagreement on the part of Remote Solution that the agreement at issue here applied to Contec Corporation as Contec Corporation. I think that's well-established by the evidence that I put forward in the reply brief.

THE COURT: As I said before, the Second

Circuit warns us and wants us to sua sponte check subject

matter jurisdiction. They get very upset when there's an

appeal and it turns out there's no subject matter

jurisdiction and the parties and the judge did not raise it.

And we're supposed to look into these issues right away so

that it doesn't go to the Second Circuit after a two-week

trial and then, finally, somebody, the losing party usually,

will all of a sudden come up to the Second Circuit and raise

the issue that, gee, there was never subject matter

jurisdiction. Well, they get sanctioned for not raising the

issue earlier, but the whole case then gets thrown out and

two weeks are wasted. And that's just what I look like I'm

facing here.

And so, I believe I know what I am going to do and I am ready to do it, unless either one wants to --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Contec v. Remote Solution - 03-CV-910

10

MR. STEIN: Well, I have two requests. One request is that I can go back to the office to look into the issue and maybe convince you that there is subject matter jurisdiction by filing a paper. And the second is if we could just file the amended complaint without dismissing the originally-filed complaint.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, just two observations: One is the complaint does allege a contract with Contec and Remote; that's admitted in the answer. answer says there was such a contract. The motion papers served by Remote say the same thing. That's what's on the face of the complaint. What the Court is doing looking at the underlying documents, I understand that, but the other point I make, your Honor, I believe the parties are all here, the issue is fully briefed, it's a matter of a technicality, at best. I think we can amend nunc pro tunc now and decide the matter which is otherwise to be decided.

THE COURT: All right. Contrary to what you just said, Mr. Williams, this is not merely a technicality. This is a matter whether I have jurisdiction or authority to do anything in this matter. And as we now stand, pursuant to Federal Rule Civil Procedure 12(h)(3), an action must be dismissed when it appears that subject matter jurisdiction is lacking. Here, plaintiff seeks relief based upon an

Page 12 of 14

admitted contract between Contec, LP, regardless of what's in the complaint, and defendant Remote Solution. The plaintiff, Contec Corp., is not a signatory to the contract and, therefore, lacks standing to assert rights under it.

No reference is made in the complaint to Contec, LP, at all.

Contec Corporation argues in reply that it is the successor in interest to Contec, LP, and Contec, LLC, and, therefore, is a party to the agreement. Further, Contec Corp. contends that Remote Solution waived any objection to an assignment of contractual rights or is equitably estopped from asserting that the mere change of corporate form constitutes an assignment prohibited by the agreement.

While it appears that Contec Corp. may be correct, that a change in corporate form, i.e., a successor in interest would not conflict with the nonassignment clause, it still appears, from the face of the complaint, that subject matter jurisdiction is lacking. In fact, at present, subject matter jurisdiction is, in fact, lacking.

Therefore, the complaint will be dismissed, without prejudice, to file an amended complaint asserting proper subject matter jurisdiction on or before October 10, 2003. The motion and cross-motion in this case are dismissed as moot, without prejudice, to renew within 30 days after the filing of the amended complaint, if any.

	Contec v. Remote Solution - 03-CV-910	12
1	This is the decision of the Court. No	
2	written decision will follow. A summary order will be	
3	filed.	
4	Anything further, gentlemen?	
5	MR. HELLER: No, Judge.	
б	MR. STEIN: No, your Honor.	
7	(This matter adjourned at 12:52 PM.)	
8	·	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	·	
20		
21	. •	
22		
23		
24		
25		
	·	

CERTIFICATION:

I, THERESA J. BERICAL, RPR, CRR, Official Court Reporter in and for the United States District Court, Northern District of New York, do hereby certify that I attended at the time and place set forth in the heading hereof; that I did make a stenographic record of the proceedings held in this matter and cause the same to be transcribed; that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the same and the whole thereof.

> Mussap Serical THERESA J. BERICAL, RPR, CRR

Official Court Reporter

DATE: October 2, 2003